



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

57  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/087,552	02/26/2002	David Ethan Zoller	MS1-895US	2157

22801 7590 06/14/2005

LEE & HAYES PLLC  
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500  
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER

ABDULSELAM, ABBAS I

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2677

DATE MAILED: 06/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/087,552	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ZOLLER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Abbas I. Abdulsalam	<b>Art Unit</b> 2674	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 May 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-65 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-65 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 05/13/05 has been entered.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-65 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saxena et al. (USPN 6259449) in view of (USPN 6459441).

Regarding claim 1, Saxena teaches a method comprising: displaying a first graphical user interface (GUI) on a display screen, the first GUI being associated with a program operatively

Art Unit: 2674

configured on a first computing device (col. 1, lines 47-54, Fig. 3 (302), Fig. 4 (400, 416), col. 8, lines 28-37 and Fig. 6 (600, 604)); and displaying a second GUI on said display screen over said first GUI; (col. 1, lines 54-57, col. 9, lines 52-59 and Fig. 5 (500, 504)), the second GUI being associated with a program (col. 1, lines 62-67 and col. 2, 1-4) operatively configured on a second computing device that is operatively connected to said first computing device (Fig. 3 (316), Fig. 4, col. 4, lines 36-43 and col. 8, lines 32-37), and wherein said second GUI is displayed on substantially the full screen of said display screen (col. 9, lines 60-63 and Fig. 5 (504)). In addition, Saxena teaches that the GUIs (500, 600, 700, 800) correspond to separate devices such as speakerphone (304), and answering machine (308) as shown in Fig. 3.

Saxena does not teach “at least one identifier that identifies that said second GUI is not associated with said first computing device”.

Perroux teaches a computer program causing a formation of GUI objects, where each GUI object includes characteristics that distinguish its function from other functions within a group. See the abstract.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Saxena’s communication programs to incorporate Perroux’s computer program for the purpose of distinguishing one graphical user interface (GUI) object from another one.

Regarding claim 2, Saxena teaches at least one of said first and said second GUIs is a desktop GUI associated with an operating system (col. 8, lines 8-25 and Fig. 3 (314)).

Regarding claim 3, Saxena teaches at least one of said first and said second GUIs is an application GUI associated with an application program (col. 7, lines 51-57 and Fig. 3 (312)).

Regarding claim 4, Saxena teaches the second GUI is displayed in full screen mode on said display screen, such that none of said first GUI is visible to said user (col. 1, lines 47-61, col. 2, lines 1-7. It would have been obvious to utilize one of the communication functions in order to display extension panel screens overlapping the first interface screen).

Regarding claim 5, Saxena teaches at least one identifier is selectively displayed for a defined period of time and then no longer displayed until reactivated (col. 2, lines 1-7, col. 8, lines 48-61 and col. 14, lines 9-13. It would have been obvious to utilize one of the communication functions to assign an interval of time over which a display takes place).

Regarding claim 6, Saxena at least one identifier is reactivated after a defined period of time expires since said at least one identifier was last displayed (col. 2, lines 1-7, col. 8, lines 48-61 and col. 14, lines 9-13. It would have been obvious to utilize one of the communication functions to reactivate after an elapse of a predetermined time).

Regarding claim 7, Saxena teaches at least one identifier is reactivated after the user causes a pointing device controlled cursor to enter into a defined region of said second GUI (col. 2, lines 1-7, col. 8, lines 48-61 and col. 14, lines 9-13. It would have been obvious to utilize one

Art Unit: 2674

of the communication functions to reactivate after an elapse of a predetermined time (col. 3, lines 57-60 and Fig. 2 (222, 220)).

Regarding claim 8, Saxena teaches at least one identifier is reactivated after the user causes a pointing device controlled cursor to enter into a defined region of said second GUI and said cursor remains in said region for a definable period of time (col. 2, lines 1-7, col. 8, lines 48-61 and col. 14, lines 9-13. It would have been obvious to utilize one of the communication functions to reactivate after an elapse of a predetermined time (col. 3, 57-60, Fig. 2 (222, 220)).

Regarding claim 9, Saxena teaches at least one identifier is selectively displayed based on at least one user keyboard input (It would have been obvious to utilize Saxena's communication functions for the purpose of identifying graphical user interfaces corresponding to different extension panel display screens; Fig. 2 (222, 221) and col. 3, lines 55-60).

Regarding claim 10, Saxena teaches at least one identifier is selectively displayed by said program operatively configured on said second computing device (Fig. 3 (304, 306, 308, 310, 312, 314) and col. 4, lines 31-41).

Regarding claim 11, Saxena teaches at least one identifier includes information identifying said second computing device (Fig. 3 (304, 306, 308, 310, 312, 314) and col. 4, lines 31-41).

Regarding claim 12, Saxena teaches at least one identifier includes at least one user selectable feature that is operatively configured to provide at least one user input to said second computing device (Fig. 3, for example Fax (310); col. 4, lines 31-41).

Regarding claim 13, a method comprising: generating graphical user interface (GUI) data suitable for being displayed on a display screen, the GUI data being associated with a program operatively configured on a computing device (col. 1, lines 47-54, Fig. 3 (302), Fig. 4 (400, 416) and col. 8, lines 28-37); that is configurable to be operatively coupled to another computing device, wherein said another computing device is connected to said display screen (Fig. 3 (316), Fig. 4, col. 4, lines 36-43 and col. 8, lines 32-37), and if displayed on said display screen said GUI data is configured to use substantially the full screen of said display screen (col.9, lines 60-63 and Fig. 5 (504)).

Saxena does not teach, "GUI data that includes data for displaying at least one identifier that identifies that said GUI data is associated with said computing device.

Perroux teaches a computer program causing a formation of GUI objects, where each GUI object includes characteristics that distinguish its function from other functions within a group. See the abstract.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Saxena's communication programs to incorporate Perroux's computer program for the purpose of distinguishing one graphical user interface (GUI ) object from another one.

Regarding claim 14, Saxena teaches that GUI data includes desktop GUI data associated with an operating system running on said computing device (col. 8, lines 8-25 and Fig. 3 (314)).

Regarding claim 15, Saxena teaches that GUI data includes application GUI data associated with an application program running on said computing device (col. 7, lines 51-57 and Fig. 3 (312)).

Regarding claim 16, Saxena teaches medium having computer-executable instructions (see the abstract) for performing acts comprising: displaying a first graphical user interface (GUI) on a display screen, the first GUI being associated with a program operatively configured on a first computing device (col. 1, lines 47-54, Fig. 3 (302), Fig. 4 (400, 416) and col. 8, lines 28-37); and displaying a second GUI on said display screen over said first GUI (col. 1, lines 54-57, col. 9, lines 52-59 and Fig. 5 (500, 504)), the second GUI being associated with a program (col. 1, lines 62-67 and col. 2, 1-4) operatively configured on a second computing device that is operatively connected to said first computing device (Fig. 3 (316), Fig. 4, col. 4, lines 36-43, and col. 8, lines 32-37), and wherein said second GUI is displayed on substantially the full screen of said display screen (col. 9, lines 60-63, Fig. 5 (504)).

Saxena does not specifically teach “at least one identifier that identifies that the second GUI is not associated with said first computing device”.



Art Unit: 2674

Perroux teaches a computer program causing a formation of GUI objects, where each GUI object includes characteristics that distinguish its function from other functions within a group. See the abstract.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Saxena's communication programs to incorporate Perroux's computer program for the purpose of distinguishing one graphical user interface (GUI) object from another one.

Regarding claim 17, Saxena teaches at least one of said first and said second GUIs is a desktop GUI associated with an operating system (col. 8, lines 8-25 and Fig. 3 (314)).

Regarding claim 18, Saxena teaches at least one of said first and said second GUIs is an application GUI associated with an application program (col. 7, lines 51-57 and Fig. 3 (312)).

Regarding claim 19, Saxena teaches at least one identifier is selectively displayed for a defined period of time and then no longer displayed until reactivated (col. 2, lines 1-7, col. 8, lines 48-61 and col. 14, lines 9-13. It would have been obvious to utilize one of the communication functions to assign an interval of time over which a display takes place).

Regarding claim 20, Saxena teaches at least one identifier includes information identifying said second computing device (Fig. 3 (304, 306, 308, 310, 312, 314) and col. 4, lines 31-41).

Regarding claim 21, Saxena teaches at least one identifier includes at least one user selectable feature that is operatively configured to provide at least one user input to said second computing device (Fig. 3. for example Fax (310); col. 4, lines 31-41).

Regarding claim 22, Saxena teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions (see the abstract) for performing acts comprising: generating graphical user interface (GUI) data suitable for being displayed on a display screen, the GUI data being associated with a program operatively configured on a computing device (col. 1, lines 47-54, Fig. 3 (302), Fig. 4 (400, 416) and col. 8, lines 28-37); that is configurable to be operatively coupled to another computing device, wherein said another computing device is connected to said display screen (Fig. 3 (316), Fig. 4, col. 4, lines 36-43 and col. 8, lines 32-37) and generating said GUI data such that if displayed on said display screen said GUI data uses substantially the full screen of said display screen (col.9, lines 60-63 and Fig. 5 (504)).

Saxena does not teach, “generating said GUI data to include data for displaying at least one identifier that identifies that said GUI data is associated with said computing device”.

Perroux teaches a computer program causing a formation of GUI objects, where each GUI object includes characteristics that distinguish its function from other functions within a group. See the abstract.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Saxena’s communication programs to incorporate Perroux’s computer

Art Unit: 2674

program for the purpose of distinguishing one graphical user interface (GUI) object from another one.

Regarding claim 23, Saxena teaches GUI data that includes desktop GUI data associated with an operating system running on said computing device (col. 8, lines 8-25 and Fig. 3 (314)).

Regarding claim 24, Saxena teaches that GUI data includes application GUI data associated with an application program running on said computing device (col. 7, lines 51-57 and Fig. 3 (312)).

Regarding claim 25, Saxena teaches a system comprising: a display screen; a communication link (Fig. 3, for example a sound card, speaker, col. 5, lines 34-37); a first computing device operatively coupled to said display screen and said communication link (Fig. 3), and configured to display a first graphical user interface (GUI) on said display screen, the first GUI being associated with a program running on said first computing device (col. 1, lines 47-54, Fig. 3 (302), Fig. 4 (400, 416) and col. 8, lines 28-37) ; a second computing device operatively coupled to said communication link (Fig. 3) and thusly said first computing device, said second computing device being configured to display a second GUI on said display screen over said first GUI (col. 1, lines 54-57, col. 9, lines 52-59 and Fig. 5 (500, 504)), the second GUI being associated with a program (col. 1, lines 62-67 and col. 2, 1-4) operatively configured on said second computing device, and wherein said second GUI is displayed on substantially the full screen of said display screen (col. 9, lines 60-63 and Fig. 5 (504)).

Art Unit: 2674

Saxena does not specifically teach “at least one identifier that identifies that the second GUI is not associated with said first computing device”.

Perroux teaches a computer program causing a formation of GUI objects, where each GUI object includes characteristics that distinguish its function from other functions within a group. See the abstract.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Saxena’s communication programs to incorporate Perroux’s computer program for the purpose of distinguishing one graphical user interface (GUI) object from another one.

Regarding claim 26, Saxena teaches at least one of said first and said second GUIs is a desktop GUI associated with an operating system (col. 8, lines 8-25 and Fig. 3 (314)).

Regarding claim 27, Saxena teaches at least one of said first and said second GUIs is an application GUI associated with an application program (col. 7, lines 51-57 and Fig. 3 (312)).

Regarding claim 28, Saxena teaches the second GUI is displayed in full screen mode on said display screen, such that none of said first GUI is visible to said user (col. 1, lines 47-61, col. 2, lines 1-7. It would have been obvious to utilize one of the communication functions in order to display extension panel screens overlapping the first interface screen).

Regarding claim 29, Saxena teaches at least one identifier is selectively displayed for a defined period of time and then no longer displayed until reactivated (col. 2, lines 1-7, col. 8,

Art Unit: 2674

lines 48-61 and col. 14, lines 9-13. It would have been obvious to utilize one of the communication functions to assign an interval of time over which a display takes place).

Regarding claim 30, Saxena teaches at least one identifier is reactivated after a defined period of time expires since said at least one identifier was last displayed (col. 2, lines 1-7, col. 8, lines 48-61 and col. 14, lines 9-13. It would have been obvious to utilize one of the communication functions to reactivate after an elapse of a predetermined time).

Regarding claim 31, Saxena teaches at least one identifier is reactivated after the user causes a pointing device controlled cursor to enter into a defined region of said second GUI (col. 2, lines 1-7, col. 8, lines 48-61 and col. 14, lines 9-13. It would have been obvious to utilize one of the communication functions to reactivate after an elapse of a predetermined time; col. 3, lines 57-60 and Fig. 2 (222, 220)).

Regarding claim 32, Saxena teaches a pointing device operatively coupled to said first computing device; and wherein said at least one identifier is reactivated after the user causes a pointing device controlled cursor to enter into a defined region of said second GUI and said cursor remains in said region for a definable period of time (col. 2, lines 1-7, col. 8, lines 48-61 and col. 14, lines 9-13.

Regarding claim 33, Saxena teaches at least one identifier is selectively displayed based on at least one user keyboard input (It would have been obvious to utilize Saxena's

Art Unit: 2674

communication functions for the purpose of identifying graphical user interfaces corresponding to different extension panel display screens; Fig. 2 (222, 221) and col. 3, lines 55-60).

Regarding claim 34, Saxena teaches at least one identifier is selectively displayed by said second computing device (Fig. 3 (304, 306, 308, 310, 312, 314) and col. 4, lines 31-41).

Regarding claim 35, Saxena teaches at least one identifier includes information identifying said second computing device (Fig. 3 (304, 306, 308, 310, 312, 314) and col. 4, lines 31-41).

Regarding claim 36, Saxena teaches at least one identifier includes at least one user selectable feature that is operatively configured to provide at least one user input to said second computing device (Fig. 3., for example Fax (310); col. 4, lines 31-41).

Regarding claim 37, Saxena teaches an apparatus comprising: a computing device capable of being operatively connected to at least one other computing device through an interconnecting communication channel, said computing device having logic configured to generate graphical user interface (GUI) data suitable for display on a display screen (col. 1, lines 47-54, Fig. 3 (302), Fig. 4 (400, 416) and col. 8, lines 28-37) coupled to said other computing device (Fig. 3 (316)), wherein if displayed on said display screen said GUI data is configured to use substantially the full screen of said display screen ( col. 9, lines 60-63 and Fig. 5 (504)).

Saxena does not teach GUI data that includes data for displaying “at least one identifier that identifies that said GUI data is associated with said computing device”.

Art Unit: 2674

Perroux teaches a computer program causing a formation of GUI objects, where each GUI object includes characteristics that distinguish its function from other functions within a group. See the abstract.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Saxena's communication programs to incorporate Perroux's computer program for the purpose of distinguishing one graphical user interface (GUI) object from another one.

Regarding claim 38, Saxena teaches that GUI data includes desktop GUI data associated with operating system logic configured on said computing device (col. 8, lines 8-25 and Fig. 3 (314)).

Regarding claim 39, Saxena teaches that GUI data includes application GUI data associated with application program logic configured on said computing device (col. 8, lines 8-25 and Fig. 3 (314)).

Regarding claim 40, Saxena teaches a method comprising: displaying a first graphical user interface (GUI) on a display screen, the first GUI being associated with a first program (col. 1, lines 47-54, Fig. 3 (302), Fig. 4 (400, 416) and col. 8, lines 28-37); and displaying a second GUI on said display screen over said first GUI (col. 1, lines 54-57, col. 9, lines 52-59 and Fig. 5 (500, 504)), the second GUI being associated with a second program (col. 1, lines 62-67 and col.

Art Unit: 2674

2, lines 1-4), and wherein said second GUI is displayed on substantially the full screen of said display screen (col. 9, lines 60-63 and Fig. 5 (504)).

Saxena does not teach, “least one identifier that identifies that said second GUI is not associated with said first program”.

Perroux teaches a computer program causing a formation of GUI objects, where each GUI object includes characteristics that distinguish its function from other functions within a group. See the abstract.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Saxena’s communication programs to incorporate Perroux’s computer program for the purpose of distinguishing one graphical user interface (GUI) object from another one.

Regarding claim 41, Saxena teaches at least one of said first and said second GUIs is a desktop GUI associated with an operating system (col. 8, lines 8-25 and Fig. 3 (314)).

Regarding claim 42, Saxena teaches at least one of said first and said second GUIs is an application GUI associated with an application program (col. 7, lines 51-57 and Fig. 3 (312)).

Regarding claim 43, Saxena teaches that the second GUI is displayed in full screen mode on said display screen, such that none of said first GUI is visible to said user (col. 1, lines 47-61, col. 2, lines 1-7. It would have been obvious to utilize one of the communication functions in order to display extension panel screens overlapping the first interface screen).



Art Unit: 2674

Regarding claim 44, Saxena teaches at least one identifier is selectively displayed for a defined period of time and then no longer displayed until reactivated (col. 2, lines 1-7, col. 8, lines 48-61 and col. 14, lines 9-13. It would have been obvious to utilize one of the communication functions to assign an interval of time over which a display takes place).

Regarding claim 45, Saxena teaches at least one identifier is reactivated after a defined period of time expires since said at least one identifier was last displayed (col. 2, lines 1-7, col. 8, lines 48-61 and col. 14, lines 9-13. It would have been obvious to utilize one of the communication functions to reactivate after an elapse of a predetermined time).

Regarding claim 46, Saxena teaches at least one identifier is reactivated after the user causes a pointing device controlled cursor to enter into a defined region of said second GUI (col. 2, lines 1-7, col. 8, lines 48-61 and col. 14, lines 9-13. It would have been obvious to utilize one of the communication functions to reactivate after an elapse of a predetermined time; col. 3, lines 57-60 and Fig. 2 (222, 220)).

Regarding claim 47, Saxena teaches at least one identifier is reactivated after the user causes a pointing device controlled cursor to enter into a defined region of said second GUI and said cursor remains in said region for a definable period of time (col. 2, lines 1-7, col. 8, lines 48-61 and col. 14, lines 9-13. It would have been obvious to utilize one of the communication functions to reactivate after an elapse of a predetermined time; col. 3, 57-60, Fig. 2 (222, 220)).

Regarding claim 48, Saxena teaches at least one identifier is selectively displayed based on at least one user keyboard input (It would have been obvious to utilize Saxena's communication functions for the purpose of identifying graphical user interfaces corresponding to different extension panel display screens; Fig. 2 (222, 221) and col. 3, lines 55-60).

Regarding claim 49, Saxena teaches at least one identifier includes information identifying said second program (Fig. 3 (304, 306, 308, 310, 312, 314) and col. 4, lines 31-41).

Regarding claim 50, Saxena teaches at least one identifier includes at least one user selectable feature that is operatively configured to provide at least one user input to said second program (Fig. 3., for example Fax (310); col. 4, lines 31-41).

Regarding claim 51, Saxena teaches said first program and said second program are operatively running on at least one processing unit within a single computer (Fig. 2 (202) and col. 3 and lines 28-46).

Regarding claim 52, Saxena teaches said first program and said second program are operatively running on at processing units within different computers (Fig. 1 (102, 104), and col. 3 and lines 28-46).

Regarding claim 53, Saxena teaches a computer readable medium having computer implement able instructions (see the abstract) for performing acts comprising: displaying a first graphical user interface (GUI) on a display screen, the first GUI being associated with a first program (col. 1, lines 47-54, Fig. 3 (302), Fig. 4 (400, 416) and col. 8, lines 28-37); and displaying a second GUI on said display screen over said first GUI, the second GUI being associated with a second program (Fig. 3 (316), Fig. 4, col. 4, lines 36-43 and col. 8, lines 32-37), and wherein said second GUI is displayed on substantially the full screen of said display screen (col. 9, lines 60-63, Fig. 5 (504)).

Saxena does not specifically teach “at least one identifier that identifies that the second GUI is not associated with said first program”.

Perroux teaches a computer program causing a formation of GUI objects, where each GUI object includes characteristics that distinguish its function from other functions within a group. See the abstract.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Saxena’s communication programs to incorporate Perroux’s computer program for the purpose of distinguishing one graphical user interface (GUI) object from another one.

Regarding claim 54, Saxena teaches at least one of said first and said second GUIs is a desktop GUI associated with an operating system (col. 8, lines 8-25 and Fig. 3 (314)).

Art Unit: 2674

Regarding claim 55, Saxena teaches at least one of said first and said second GUIs is an application GUI associated with an application program (col. 7, lines 51-57 and Fig. 3 (312)).

Regarding claim 56, Saxena teaches said second GUI is displayed in full screen mode on said display screen, such that none of said first GUI is visible to said user (col. 1, lines 47-61, col. 2, lines 1-7. It would have been obvious to utilize one of the communication functions in order to display extension panel screens overlapping the first interface screen).

Regarding claim 57, Saxena teaches at least one identifier is selectively displayed for a defined period of time and then no longer displayed until reactivated (col. 2, lines 1-7, col. 8, lines 48-61 and col. 14, lines 9-13. It would have been obvious to utilize one of the communication functions to assign an interval of time over which a display takes place).

Regarding claim 58, Saxena teaches at least one identifier is reactivated after a defined period of time expires since said at least one identifier was last displayed (col. 2, lines 1-7, col. 8, lines 48-61 and col. 14, lines 9-13. It would have been obvious to utilize one of the communication functions to reactivate after an elapse of a predetermined time).

Regarding claim 59, Saxena teaches at least one identifier is reactivated after the user causes a pointing device controlled cursor to enter into a defined region of said second GUI (col. 2, lines 1-7, col. 8, lines 48-61 and col. 14, lines 9-13. It would have been obvious to utilize one

Art Unit: 2674

of the communication functions to reactivate after an elapse of a predetermined time; col. 3, lines 57-60 and Fig. 2 (222, 220)).

Regarding claim 60, Saxena teaches at least one identifier is reactivated after the user causes a pointing device controlled cursor to enter into a defined region of said second GUI and said cursor remains in said region for a definable period of time (col. 2, lines 1-7, col. 8, lines 48-61 and col. 14, lines 9-13. It would have been obvious to utilize one of the communication functions to reactivate after an elapse of a predetermined time; col. 3, 57-60, Fig. 2 (222, 220)).

Regarding claim 61, Saxena teaches at least one identifier is selectively displayed based on at least one user keyboard input (It would have been obvious to utilize Saxena's communication functions for the purpose of identifying graphical user interfaces corresponding to different extension panel display screens; Fig. 2 (222, 221) and col. 3, lines 55-60).

Regarding claim 62, Saxena teaches at least one identifier includes information identifying said second program (Fig. 3 (304, 306, 308, 310, 312, 314) and col. 4, lines 31-41).

Regarding claim 63, Saxena teaches at least one identifier includes at least one user selectable feature that is operatively configured to provide at least one user input to said second program (Fig. 3., for example Fax (310); col. 4, lines 31-41).

Art Unit: 2674

Regarding claim 64, Saxena teaches said first program and said second program are operatively running on at least one processing unit within a single computer (Fig. 2 (202) and col. 3 and lines 28-46).

Regarding claim 65, Saxena teaches said first program and said second program are operatively running on at processing units within different computers (Fig. 1 (102, 104), and col. 3 and lines 28-46).

### *Conclusion*

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following art is cited for further reference.

6,611,276 to Muratori et al.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Abbas I. Abdulsalam whose telephone number is 571-272-7685. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:00 A.M. to 5:30 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Edouard can be reached on 571-272-7603. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

Art Unit: 2674

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Abbas Abdulsalam

Examiner

Art Unit 2674

June 3, 2005

  
**XIAO WU**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**